Appl. No. 10/533,358 Amdt. dated April 29, 2007

Reply to Office action of November 3, 2006

## REMARKS

Reconsideration is respectfully requested. Claims 1-16 were present in the application. Claim 1 is amended herein. Claims 8-11 are canceled. New claims 17-28 are added.

The title is objected to. Applicant thanks the Examiner for providing suggested wording for the title, which has been incorporated into the title.

Claims 1, 2, 7 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. \$102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by Porambo et al (US 5,280,638).

Claims 3, 4, 9 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. \$103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Porambo et al in view of Churchill et al (US 3,950,750).

Claims 5, 6 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. \$103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Porambo et al in view of Argo et al (US 4,764,978).

Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. \$103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Porambo et al in view of Counselmann, III et al (US 2002/0126,046).

Claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Porambo et al in view of Uda (US 5,940,744).

Claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Porambo et al in view of Schetelig et al (US 6.895.229).

Appl. No. 10/533,358 Amdt. dated April 29, 2007

Amut. dated April 29, 2007

Reply to Office action of November 3, 2006

Claim 15 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Porambo et al in view of Schetelig et al (US 6,895,229) and further in view of Isomichi et al (US 2002/0081,999).

Claim 16 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. \$103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Porambo et al in view of Schetelig et al (US 6,895,229) and further in view of Korycan (US 5,950,139).

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections.

Claim 1 is amended herein to incorporate the language of claim 8 therein. New claim 17 is added representing claim 1 with the language of original claim 11 incorporated therein.

While it is disclosed by Porambo to have the configuration which is a receiver for receiving both AM band FM band, wherein aligning is made of the RF filters 36 and 38 included in the configuration for receiving the FM band to maximize their sensitivity by using the output signal of a crystal oscillator for receiving the AM band, applicant's claimed system is different. In applicant's system, a signal required for determining the quality of the AM reception operation with using a crystal oscillator required to receive AM band is generated (Fig.1). Also, in the present application, a signal required for determining quality of the FM reception operation with using a crystal oscillator required to receive FM band is generated (Fig.5).

Appl. No. 10/533,358

Amdt. dated April 29, 2007

Reply to Office action of November 3, 2006

The Porambo patent is for aligning the RF filters 36 and 38 in the circuit for FM band to maximize the sensitivity thereof. But, on the other hand, the present application is for testing the operation of the receiver, that is, for determining whether the receiver operates normally or not.

Pombo does not appreciate this and the combination of the other documents relied on does not add this appreciation. It is therefore submitted that the Pombo document, whether considered alone or when combined as proposed by the Office Action, does not teach or suggest the claims.

Further, in the present invention, test signal is generated by a simple configuration, that is, the test signal is generated by frequency dividing (or, multiplying) the output of the crystal oscillator required for reception operation of the receiver, which is subjected to the operational test. This provides a simplified construction and cost relative to the Pombo and combination documents.

In light of the above noted amendments and remarks, this application is believed in condition for allowance and notice thereof is respectfully solicited. The Examiner is asked to contact applicant's attorney at 503-224-0115 if there are any questions.

It is believed that no further fees are due with this filing or that the required fees are being submitted herewith. if additional fees are required to keep the application pending,

Appl. No. 10/533,358 Amdt. dated April 29, 2007

Amdt. dated April 29, 2007 Reply to Office action of November 3, 2006

please charge deposit account 503036. If fee refund is owed,

please charge deposit account 503036. If fee refund is owed, please refund to deposit account 503036.

Respectfully submitted,

James H. Walters, Reg. No. 35,73

Customer number 802 patenttm.us

P.O. Box 82788 Portland, Oregon 97282-0788 US

(503) 224-0115 DOCKET: A-494

Certification of Electronic Transmission

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being electronically transmitted to the Patent and Trademark Office via the EFS system on this April 29, 2007.

h